

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application, and respectfully requests favorable reconsideration of the application in view of the comments set forth below.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶1***

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claim 6 and the subject matter objected to in the Office action have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶1 is moot in view of the amendments.

#### ***Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)***

Claims 2 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sprott *et al.* (US 5,237,140) (hereinafter “Sprott”). However, Applicant respectfully submits that Sprott fails to teach every feature of the invention recited in amended claim 2.

More specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Sprott fails to teach a task light including rotatable illumination means that is rotatable relative to a display. The globe in Sprott is identified in the Office action as teaching the claimed display, and the LEDs installed therein as the illumination device. While the LEDs installed in the globe of Sprott can rotate along with the globe, Sprott fails to teach or suggest an illumination device such as the LED that can rotate relative to the display (i.e., the LEDs in Sprott can not rotate relative to the globe).

Further with respect to claim 2, Applicant respectfully submits that Sprott fails to teach rotating means for rotating the illumination means relative to the display to illuminate approximately the entire console when the display is rotated to a plurality of different positions as claimed. Even if the LEDs in Sprott are considered to be rotatable for the sake of discussion (which Applicant maintains they are not rotatable relative to the display as claimed), Applicant respectfully submits that the LEDs do not illuminate approximately the entire console, much less illuminate approximately the entire console when the display is rotated to a plurality of different

positions as claimed. Sprott also fails to teach that the rotating of the illumination means is based on the rotational position of the display with respect to the console as claimed.

For at least the above reasons, Sprott fails to teach every limitation found in claim 2 as required to maintain a rejection of that claim under 35 U.S.C. §102(b). Further, since claim 8 depends from claim 2, it is also not anticipated by Sprott for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

*Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)*

Claims 1 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Lo (US 2005/0047073) (hereinafter “Lo”) in view of Choi (US 2004/0133817) (hereinafter “Choi”) and further in view of Sprott (US 5,057,024) (hereinafter “Sprott”). However, Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Lo, Choi and Sprott fails to teach every feature of the amended claims.

Specifically with regard to claim 1, the combination of Lo, Choi and Sprott fails to teach, suggest or otherwise render predictable illuminating a different “illumination means” for illuminating a console based on a rotational position of a display. As claimed, the plural illumination means are aligned at different locations on the display, and different one is activated to illuminate a console that outputs contents to be displayed by the display. Thus, the console can be illuminated by the different illumination means when the display is rotated to any of the three positions.

Lo is cited as disclosing a plurality of illumination means at different locations. The light sources 150 disclosed by Lo appear to be aligned in the horizontal direction, and illuminate a console, but Lo fails to teach that any of the light sources 150 are illuminated separate from any of the other light sources 150 as claimed. The absence of such a teaching is correctly noted in the Office action. Choi, is combined with Lo in the Office action as teaching the selective illumination of the different illumination means. However, Choi discloses controlling the power supplied to an input device (i.e., a touch-sensitive panel embedded within the display screen) to turn the input device off when the display is rotated such that the input device is not available for use. Choi does not control operation of an illumination device, much less an illumination device for illuminating a console while the display is rotated to a plurality of different positions. And

Sprott, cited as teaching illuminating a console with second illumination means when the display is in a second position and with third illumination means when the display is in a third position, does not teach illuminating a console at all. Sprott discloses a globe with LEDs installed at various geographic locations of interest to illuminate those geographic locations on the globe. The illumination in Sprott is of geographic regions of the earth, not a console as claimed. Further, the display in Sprott is not operable to present output from the console to a user, and Sprott also fails to teach or otherwise suggest that illumination of a console is performed by the globe at various different rotational positions.

Further with regard to claim 1, one of ordinary skill in the art would not find it obvious to modify Lo according to the teachings of Choi as suggested in the Office action. All of the light sources in Lo are operable at the same time to illuminate the keyboard of the notebook computer disclosed therein. If one of the light sources in Lo was shut off while another was illuminated, much of the keyboard would not be able to be seen by the user, thereby defeating the primary purpose of the invention in Lo. Thus, one of ordinary skill would not find it obvious to modify Lo as suggested in the Office action.

Further with respect to claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Sprott is non-analogous art that should not be considered for purposes of 35 U.S.C. §103(a). To determine whether Sprott constitutes non-analogous art, “any need or problem known in the field of endeavor at the time of the invention and addressed by the patent [or application at issue] can provide a reason for combining the elements in the manner claimed.” M.P.E.P. §2141.01(a)(I), citing *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 904, 920, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1397 (2007). Thus a reference in a field different from that of applicant's endeavor may be reasonably pertinent if it is one which, because of the matter with which it deals, logically would have commended itself to an inventor's attention in considering his or her invention as a whole. M.P.E.P. §2141.01(a)(I).

The invention is directed to a task light to be provided to a display for illuminating a console when a display is rotated to a plurality of different positions. Sprott is directed toward a globe with a plurality of LEDs that can be illuminated to mark different geographic locations on the globe. The LEDs in the globe disclosed by Sprott are not for illuminating anything other than the particular geographic region on the globe. Applicant respectfully submits that there is

no need or problem known in the field of task lights that is also addressed by the toy globe in Sprott. In other words, the subject matter in Sprott would not have commended itself to an inventor's attention considering the claimed task light as a whole.

The remaining claims in the present application, specifically claims 2-14, are allowable for the limitations therein and for the limitations of the claims from which they depend.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned agent to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No.: NIHE-40810.

Respectfully submitted,  
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By:   
Donald J. Firca, Jr. - Reg. No. 48,140

1801 East 9<sup>th</sup> Street  
Suite 1200  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108  
(216) 579-1700

Date: February 4, 2010